

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 DACIANA QUACH,
8 Plaintiff,
9 v.
10 WALGREEN CO.,
11 Defendant.

Case No. [24-cv-07052-JSW](#)

**ORDER REGARDING RESPONSES TO
ORDER TO PARTIES TO SHOW
CAUSE WHY CASE SHOULD NOT BE
TRANSFERRED UNDER 28 U.S.C. §
1404(A)**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 26, 27

12
13 The Court has received and considered the parties' responses to the Court's Order to Show
14 Cause regarding whether this case should be transferred under 28 U.S.C. section 1404(a). The
15 parties' responses address whether venue in this District was proper. Based on Defendant's
16 assertion that Plaintiff worked in a store in Bakersfield, California, the Court's direction was to
17 show cause why the case should not be transferred to the Eastern District for the "convenience of
18 parties and witnesses, [and] in the interest of justice." 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). Although the court in
19 *Costlow v. Weeks* did address the propriety of venue, the court analogized the district court's
20 handling of that issue "to the long-approved practice of permitting a court to transfer a case sua
21 sponte under the doctrine of *forum non conveniens*, ..., so long as the parties are first given the
22 opportunity to present their views on the issue."

23 Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS the parties to show cause why this case should
24 not be transferred to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California for the
25 convenience of the parties, witnesses, and in the interest of justice. The parties shall file
26 simultaneous briefs responding to this Order to Show Cause by January 24, 2025 and may file
27 responses to those briefs by January 31, 2025.

28 //

If the Court requires further information from the parties or a hearing on the issue, it will issue a separate Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 17, 2025

JEFFREY S. WHITE
United States District Judge

United States District Court
Northern District of California